



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,184	11/12/2003	Dennis J. Sammut	SAMMUT-07597	6125

7590 10/13/2006  
David A. Casimir  
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
Suite 350  
101 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

EXAMINER

CLEMENT, MICHELLE RENEE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3641

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. In response to applicant's contention that the examiner has impermissibly withdrawn claims to the non-elected species, it is noted that the claims are properly currently withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) since there is **currently** no allowable generic or linking claim. *Upon the allowance of a generic claim*, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a). Claims 48, 49, 55-72, and 81-83 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6/21/05 and 2/17/06.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments filed 8/8/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's contention that Reed does not disclose the claimed invention because Reed discloses a scope in which the non-activated lines are essentially invisible, it is noted that Reed discloses the claimed invention including a plurality of *visible* secondary horizontal cross-hairs, a *visible* primary vertical cross-hair, a plurality of *visible* secondary cross-hairs. It does not appear that applicant is disputing that **ALL** of the plurality of cross-hairs (primary, secondary, horizontal and vertical) are visible, applicant's arguments appear to rest on the fact that the cross-hairs of Reed are not all visible simultaneously and that

the microprocessor selects only one particular secondary cross-hair to be visible at a time. This argument appears to be narrower than applicant's broadly stated claim. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a plurality of *simultaneously visible* secondary horizontal cross-hairs and a plurality of *simultaneously visible* secondary vertical cross-hairs) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

For the reasons stated above the rejections stand.

#### ***Specification***

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 45, 46, 50, 51, 53, 73, and 75-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reed (US Patent # 4,695,161). Reed discloses a ballistics calculator system for computing targeting information to hit a target, comprising a processor, the processor comprising a ballistics computer program for analyzing information to accurately aim a firearm at a target

using a target acquisition device with a reticle, the program using information regarding the target acquisition device and reticle being used, wherein the type of target acquisition device and reticle comprise, a reticle comprising a plurality of visible secondary horizontal cross-hairs at predetermined distances along a primary visible vertical cross-hair and a plurality of visible secondary vertical cross-hairs at predetermined distances along at least some of the visible secondary horizontal cross-hairs and an output using the visible secondary horizontal cross-hairs and visible secondary vertical cross-hairs to identify an aiming point for hitting the target. The reticle comprises a visible primary vertical and visible horizontal cross-hair. At least some of the visible secondary horizontal and visible vertical cross-hairs are evenly spaced and are connected to form a grid. Information regarding the target acquisition device and reticle being used can include the positional relationship between the target acquisition device and the firearm. The device further comprises a housing, means for mounting the housing in a fixed predetermined position relative to a firearm. The target acquisition device further comprises an objective lens mounted in one end of the housing and an ocular lens mounted in an opposite end. The target acquisition device further comprises a projected image and is configured to display information on a display screen, wherein the information displayed is an image of a reticle. Each of the plurality of secondary horizontal cross-hairs, the plurality of secondary vertical cross-hairs are visible although not necessarily simultaneously visible, however it is noted that simultaneous visible cross-hairs is not required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3641

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 47, 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed as applied to claims 45 and 46 above, and further in view of Wascher et al. (US Patent # 5,491,546). Although Reed does not expressly disclose the primary vertical and horizontal cross-hairs intersecting at the optical center of the reticle, at least some of the secondary horizontal and vertical cross-hairs having identifying marks, and the reticle including range finding markings on the reticle, Wascher et al. does. Wascher et al. teaches a target acquisition device and reticle, wherein the reticle comprises primary vertical and horizontal cross-hairs that intersect at an optical center of the reticle and wherein at least some of the secondary horizontal and vertical cross-hairs have identifying marks, the reticle further including range finding marks on the reticle. Wascher et al. and Reed are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor: target acquisition devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the position of the reticle and identifying marks as taught by Wascher et al. with the device as taught by Reed. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to obtain a sighting system that included the range determining features for more accurate aiming as suggested by Wascher et al.

8. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed as applied to claim 45 above, and further in view of Cohen (US Patent # 5,375,072). Although Reed does not expressly disclose that the device comprises an elevation knob and the system providing an output of how much the knob should be turned to adjust a position of the target acquisition device relative to the firearm, Cohen does. Cohen teaches the processor and the target

acquisition device being separate units wherein the processor provides an output informing the user how much a windage knob must be turned to adjust a position of the target acquisition device so that an intersection of the primary vertical cross-section and the primary horizontal cross-hair can be used as the aiming point. Cohen and Reed are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor: target acquisition devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the separation of components as taught by Cohen with the device as taught by Reed, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art and Cohen specifically teaches the components separately.

### *Conclusion*


9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle (Shelley) Clement whose telephone number is 571.272.6884. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 571.272.6873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
MICHELLE CLEMENT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER